

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

RONNIE EDWARDS,

Case No. 2:19-cv-00806-RFB-VCF

Plaintiff

ORDER

v.

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS et al.,

Defendants

This action began with a *pro se* civil rights complaint filed under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 by the formerly incarcerated Plaintiff Ronnie Edwards. On September 16, 2020, this Court issued an order directing Plaintiff to file his updated address on or before October 16, 2020. (ECF No. 44). The deadline has now expired, and Plaintiff has not filed his updated address or otherwise responded to the Court's order.

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and "[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal" of a case. Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party's failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. See Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (affirming dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); Carey v. King, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); Malone v. U.S. Postal Service, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with court order); Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (affirming dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

In determining whether to dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules, the court must consider several factors:

1 (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to
2 manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring
3 disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives.
4 *See Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423-24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at
5 130; *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260-61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.

6 Here, the Court finds that the first two factors, the public's interest in expeditiously
7 resolving this litigation and the Court's interest in managing the docket, weigh in favor of
8 dismissal. The third factor, risk of prejudice to Defendants, also weighs in favor of
9 dismissal, since a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay
10 in filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. See Anderson v. Air
11 West, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor—public policy favoring
12 disposition of cases on their merits—is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor of
13 dismissal discussed herein. Finally, a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey
14 the court's order will result in dismissal satisfies the "consideration of alternatives"
15 requirement. Ferdik, 963 F.2d at 1262; Malone, 833 F.2d at 132-33; Henderson, 779
16 F.2d at 1424. The Court's order requiring Plaintiff to file his updated address with the
17 Court on or before October 16, 2020 expressly stated: "Failure to comply with this rule
18 may result in the dismissal of the action, entry of default judgment, or other sanctions as
19 deemed appropriate by the court." (ECF No. 44). Thus, Plaintiff had adequate warning
20 that dismissal would result from his noncompliance with the Court's order to file his
21 updated address by October 16, 2020.

22 It is therefore ordered that this action is dismissed without prejudice based on
23 Plaintiff's failure to file an updated address in compliance with this Court's September 16,
24 2020, order.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 It is further ordered that the application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (ECF No. 16)
2 is denied as moot.

3 It is further ordered that the Clerk of Court will close the case and enter judgment
4 accordingly.

5 DATED: October 21, 2020.

6
7
8 
9 RICHARD F. BOULWARE, II
10 United States District Judge
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28